



Control Number: 51415



Item Number: 585

Addendum StartPage: 0

SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-21-0538
PUC DOCKET NO. 51415

RECEIVED
2021 MAY 21 AM 11:18
FILED CLERK

APPLICATION OF SOUTHWESTERN §
ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY FOR §
AUTHORITY TO CHANGE RATES §
BEFORE THE STATE OFFICE
OF
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

**SOUTHWESTERN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE
TO TEXAS INDUSTRIAL ENERGY CONSUMERS' THIRTEENTH SET OF
REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION**

MAY 21, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>FILE NAME</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
2 ND Supplemental Response No. TIEC 13-4	51415 TIEC13S2 Pkg.pdf	2
2 ND Supplemental Attachment to No. TIEC 13-4	51415 TIEC13S2 Pkg.pdf	3

Files provided electronically on the PUC Interchange

- ✉ Network Load Reporting.msg
- ✉ Network Load Reporting_MOPC Outreach_Final.msg
- ✉ Network Load Reporting_MOPC Outreach_SD.msg
- ✉ Network Load Reporting_MOPC Outreach_SD_CL.msg
- ✉ RE Draft presentation about load reporting-1.msg
- ✉ RE Draft presentation about load reporting-2.msg
- ✉ RE Draft presentation about load reporting-3.msg

**SOAH DOCKET NO. 473-21-0538
PUC DOCKET NO. 51415**

**SOUTHWESTERN ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE
TO TEXAS INDUSTRIAL ENERGY CONSUMERS' THIRTEENTH SET OF
REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION**

Question No. TIEC 13-4:

Please provide all SPP documents relating to or discussing the educational information referenced in the preceding RFI.

Supplemental Response No. TIEC 13-4:

Please see TIEC 13-4 Attachment 1 for the requested information. Please also see TIEC 13-4 Highly Sensitive Attachment 2 for the Highly Sensitive materials responsive to this request.

Certain materials responsive to this request have been withheld as attorney/client and/or attorney work product privileged content. Pursuant to an agreement with counsel for TIEC, contemporaneously with filing this response, SWEPCO has also filed a privilege log identifying the documents that are covered by the attorney/client and/or attorney work product privilege and are not being produced.

The attachment responsive to this request is HIGHLY SENSITIVE under the terms of the Protective Order. Highly Sensitive information is available for review at the offices of Duggins Wren Mann & Romero, 600 Congress Avenue, Suite 1900, Austin, Texas, 78701, (512) 744-9300 ext. 1400, during normal business hours.

Second Supplemental Response No. TIEC 13-4:

See TIEC 13-4 S2 Attachment 3.

Prepared By: Charles J. Locke

Title: SPP, Dir Transmission Policy & Rates

Sponsored By: Charles J. Locke

Title: SPP, Dir Transmission Policy & Rates

From: Charles Locke
To: Paul Suskie; Carl Monroe
Cc: Sam Loudenslager; Tony Alexander; Steve Davis
Subject: Draft presentation about load reporting
Attachments: Network Load Reporting.pptx

Paul and Carl,

Attached is a draft presentation for the stakeholder conference call on March 28. This has only the FERC requirements portion of the discussion. We need to add slides addressing the survey results, which Steve can provide.

Please let me know whether this discussion of Tariff and FERC requirements is along the lines of what you had in mind and whether you have any changes or additions to it.

Thanks.

Charles

From: [Steve Davis](#)
To: [Charles Locke](#); [Carl Monroe](#); [Paul Suskie](#)
Cc: [Sam Loudenslager](#); [Tony Alexander](#)
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting
Date: Monday, March 26, 2018 3:07:07 PM
Attachments: [Network Load Reporting MOPC Outreach Final.pptx](#)

Final (edited) presentation attached.

Thanks,
Steve

From: Steve Davis
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2018 2:25 PM
To: Charles Locke; Carl Monroe; Paul Suskie
Cc: Sam Loudenslager; Tony Alexander
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Charles,

I've reviewed and agree with your clarifications. I'll add them and resend.

I'm looking for a free hour on our calendars prior to the meeting Wednesday to let us brainstorm initial positions on the questions posed.

Thanks,
Steve

From: Charles Locke
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 5:29 PM
To: Steve Davis; Carl Monroe; Paul Suskie
Cc: Sam Loudenslager; Tony Alexander
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Steve,

Thanks. Your slides have a good cross-section of problem areas that need discussion.

I inserted some comments and added a little verbiage.

Do we need an internal preparation meeting to discuss answers to the questions?

Charles

From: Steve Davis
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 1:23 PM

To: Carl Monroe <cmonroe@spp.org>; Charles Locke <clocke@spp.org>; Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>
Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting
Importance: High

Good afternoon,

I've added slides 26-33 to Charles' slides in an attempt to capture the survey responses that indicate some 'non-standard' treatment. I've included both GFA and BTM quotes (I've kept them anonymous), with a list of summary questions that pick out the most prevalent reasons given. Please take a look and let me know if this fits expectations on how we'll frame the group discussion Wednesday.

With this format, it may be good to have answers prepared for the questions posed on the slides.

Thanks,
Steve

From: Carl Monroe
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 11:30 AM
To: Steve Davis; Charles Locke; Paul Suskie
Cc: Sam Loudenslager; Tony Alexander
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Makes sense...
Carl

From: Steve Davis
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Charles Locke <clocke@spp.org>; Carl Monroe <cmonroe@spp.org>; Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>
Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Agree on the rabbit trails if we go there. I believe it's good discussion, but could quickly derail what we want to accomplish on this call. Maybe we mention it as an "other impact" point, and just bring up if we cover plenty of ground on the BTM and Schedule 11 discussions?

Thanks,
Steve

From: Charles Locke
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 11:15 AM
To: Carl Monroe; Paul Suskie
Cc: Sam Loudenslager; Tony Alexander; Steve Davis
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

We do have some of those GFA issues, which is one reason the Resident Load GFA requirement is stated on slide 7. That addresses the need to include GFAs in Schedule 11 billing.

We also could dive into the GFA issues with respect to Schedule 9. The problem there is that the approach becomes complicated very quickly. Whether or not GFAs should be included in Schedule 9 loads is dependent on how the host TO treats GFAs in its formula rate (for example, whether or not the TO is crediting GFA revenues in the formula rate and whether or not the cost of the associated facilities is included in rate base). There is an outstanding argument between two UMZ parties concerning that.

So the treatment of GFAs in Schedule 9 loads is situational. It also can involve SPP billing for hypothetical NITS under Attachment L. We could add a slide to summarize these points. As always, there is a risk that the discussion will head down some long rabbit trails.

Charles

From: Carl Monroe
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:26 AM
To: Charles Locke <clocke@spp.org>; Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>
Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>; Steve Davis <sdavis@spp.org>
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Looks good... also, a question..

Do we have any issues with GFAs and resident load that we also need to cover thoughts on the requirements?

Calr

From: Charles Locke
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:20 AM
To: Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>; Carl Monroe <cmonroe@spp.org>
Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>; Steve Davis <sdavis@spp.org>
Subject: Draft presentation about load reporting

Paul and Carl,

Attached is a draft presentation for the stakeholder conference call on March 28. This has only the FERC requirements portion of the discussion. We need to add slides addressing the survey results, which Steve can provide.

Please let me know whether this discussion of Tariff and FERC requirements is along the lines of

what you had in mind and whether you have any changes or additions to it.

Thanks.

Charles

This email and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential information. If you receive this email in error, please notify the sender, delete the original and all copies of the email and destroy any other hard copies of it.

From: [Charles Locke](#)
To: [Steve Davis](#); [Carl Monroe](#); [Paul Suskie](#)
Cc: [Sam Loudenslager](#); [Tony Alexander](#)
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting
Attachments: Network Load Reporting MOPC Outreach SD CL.pptx

Steve,

Thanks. Your slides have a good cross-section of problem areas that need discussion.

I inserted some comments and added a little verbiage.

Do we need an internal preparation meeting to discuss answers to the questions?

Charles

From: Steve Davis
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 1:23 PM
To: Carl Monroe <cmonroe@spp.org>; Charles Locke <clocke@spp.org>; Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>
Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting
Importance: High

Good afternoon,

I've added slides 26-33 to Charles' slides in an attempt to capture the survey responses that indicate some 'non-standard' treatment. I've included both GFA and BTM quotes (I've kept them anonymous), with a list of summary questions that pick out the most prevalent reasons given. Please take a look and let me know if this fits expectations on how we'll frame the group discussion Wednesday.

With this format, it may be good to have answers prepared for the questions posed on the slides.

Thanks,
Steve

From: Carl Monroe
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 11:30 AM
To: Steve Davis; Charles Locke; Paul Suskie
Cc: Sam Loudenslager; Tony Alexander
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Makes sense...
Carl

From: Steve Davis
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Charles Locke <clocke@spp.org>; Carl Monroe <cmonroe@spp.org>; Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>
Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Agree on the rabbit trails if we go there. I believe it's good discussion, but could quickly derail what we want to accomplish on this call. Maybe we mention it as an "other impact" point, and just bring up if we cover plenty of ground on the BTM and Schedule 11 discussions?

Thanks,
Steve

From: Charles Locke
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 11:15 AM
To: Carl Monroe; Paul Suskie
Cc: Sam Loudenslager; Tony Alexander; Steve Davis
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

We do have some of those GFA issues, which is one reason the Resident Load GFA requirement is stated on slide 7. That addresses the need to include GFAs in Schedule 11 billing.

We also could dive into the GFA issues with respect to Schedule 9. The problem there is that the approach becomes complicated very quickly. Whether or not GFAs should be included in Schedule 9 loads is dependent on how the host TO treats GFAs in its formula rate (for example, whether or not the TO is crediting GFA revenues in the formula rate and whether or not the cost of the associated facilities is included in rate base). There is an outstanding argument between two UMZ parties concerning that.

So the treatment of GFAs in Schedule 9 loads is situational. It also can involve SPP billing for hypothetical NITS under Attachment L. We could add a slide to summarize these points. As always, there is a risk that the discussion will head down some long rabbit trails.

Charles

From: Carl Monroe
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:26 AM
To: Charles Locke <clocke@spp.org>; Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>
Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>; Steve Davis <sdavis@spp.org>
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Looks good... also, a question..

Do we have any issues with GFAs and resident load that we also need to cover thoughts on the requirements?

Calr

From: Charles Locke

Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:20 AM

To: Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>; Carl Monroe <cmonroe@spp.org>

Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>; Steve Davis <sdavis@spp.org>

Subject: Draft presentation about load reporting

Paul and Carl,

Attached is a draft presentation for the stakeholder conference call on March 28. This has only the FERC requirements portion of the discussion. We need to add slides addressing the survey results, which Steve can provide.

Please let me know whether this discussion of Tariff and FERC requirements is along the lines of what you had in mind and whether you have any changes or additions to it.

Thanks.

Charles

This email and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential information. If you receive this email in error, please notify the sender, delete the original and all copies of the email and destroy any other hard copies of it.

From: [Steve Davis](#)
To: [Carl Monroe](#); [Charles Locke](#); [Paul Suskie](#)
Cc: [Sam Loudenslager](#); [Tony Alexander](#)
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting
Date: Friday, March 23, 2018 1:22:59 PM
Attachments: [Network Load Reporting MOPC Outreach SD.pptx](#)
Importance: High

Good afternoon,

I've added slides 26-33 to Charles' slides in an attempt to capture the survey responses that indicate some 'non-standard' treatment. I've included both GFA and BTM quotes (I've kept them anonymous), with a list of summary questions that pick out the most prevalent reasons given. Please take a look and let me know if this fits expectations on how we'll frame the group discussion Wednesday.

With this format, it may be good to have answers prepared for the questions posed on the slides.

Thanks,
Steve

From: Carl Monroe
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 11:30 AM
To: Steve Davis; Charles Locke; Paul Suskie
Cc: Sam Loudenslager; Tony Alexander
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Makes sense...
Carl

From: Steve Davis
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Charles Locke <clocke@spp.org>; Carl Monroe <cmonroe@spp.org>; Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>
Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Agree on the rabbit trails if we go there. I believe it's good discussion, but could quickly derail what we want to accomplish on this call. Maybe we mention it as an "other impact" point, and just bring up if we cover plenty of ground on the BTM and Schedule 11 discussions?

Thanks,
Steve

From: Charles Locke
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 11:15 AM
To: Carl Monroe; Paul Suskie
Cc: Sam Loudenslager; Tony Alexander; Steve Davis

Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

We do have some of those GFA issues, which is one reason the Resident Load GFA requirement is stated on slide 7. That addresses the need to include GFAs in Schedule 11 billing.

We also could dive into the GFA issues with respect to Schedule 9. The problem there is that the approach becomes complicated very quickly. Whether or not GFAs should be included in Schedule 9 loads is dependent on how the host TO treats GFAs in its formula rate (for example, whether or not the TO is crediting GFA revenues in the formula rate and whether or not the cost of the associated facilities is included in rate base). There is an outstanding argument between two UMZ parties concerning that.

So the treatment of GFAs in Schedule 9 loads is situational. It also can involve SPP billing for hypothetical NITS under Attachment L. We could add a slide to summarize these points. As always, there is a risk that the discussion will head down some long rabbit trails.

Charles

From: Carl Monroe

Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:26 AM

To: Charles Locke <clocke@spp.org>; Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>

Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>; Steve Davis <sdavis@spp.org>

Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Looks good... also, a question..

Do we have any issues with GFAs and resident load that we also need to cover thoughts on the requirements?

Calr

From: Charles Locke

Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:20 AM

To: Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>; Carl Monroe <cmonroe@spp.org>

Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>; Steve Davis <sdavis@spp.org>

Subject: Draft presentation about load reporting

Paul and Carl,

Attached is a draft presentation for the stakeholder conference call on March 28. This has only the FERC requirements portion of the discussion. We need to add slides addressing the survey results, which Steve can provide.

Please let me know whether this discussion of Tariff and FERC requirements is along the lines of what you had in mind and whether you have any changes or additions to it.

Thanks.

Charles

This email and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential information. If you receive this email in error, please notify the sender, delete the original and all copies of the email and destroy any other hard copies of it.

From: [Carl Monroe](#)
To: [Steve Davis](#); [Charles Locke](#); [Paul Suskie](#)
Cc: [Sam Loudenslager](#); [Tony Alexander](#)
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting
Date: Thursday, March 22, 2018 11:29:41 AM

Makes sense...

Carl

From: Steve Davis
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Charles Locke <clocke@spp.org>; Carl Monroe <cmonroe@spp.org>; Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>
Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Agree on the rabbit trails if we go there. I believe it's good discussion, but could quickly derail what we want to accomplish on this call. Maybe we mention it as an "other impact" point, and just bring up if we cover plenty of ground on the BTM and Schedule 11 discussions?

Thanks,
Steve

From: Charles Locke
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 11:15 AM
To: Carl Monroe; Paul Suskie
Cc: Sam Loudenslager; Tony Alexander; Steve Davis
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

We do have some of those GFA issues, which is one reason the Resident Load GFA requirement is stated on slide 7. That addresses the need to include GFAs in Schedule 11 billing.

We also could dive into the GFA issues with respect to Schedule 9. The problem there is that the approach becomes complicated very quickly. Whether or not GFAs should be included in Schedule 9 loads is dependent on how the host TO treats GFAs in its formula rate (for example, whether or not the TO is crediting GFA revenues in the formula rate and whether or not the cost of the associated facilities is included in rate base). There is an outstanding argument between two UMZ parties concerning that.

So the treatment of GFAs in Schedule 9 loads is situational. It also can involve SPP billing for hypothetical NITS under Attachment L. We could add a slide to summarize these points. As always, there is a risk that the discussion will head down some long rabbit trails.

Charles

From: Carl Monroe

Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:26 AM

To: Charles Locke <clocke@spp.org>; Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>

Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>; Steve Davis <sdavis@spp.org>

Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Looks good... also, a question..

Do we have any issues with GFAs and resident load that we also need to cover thoughts on the requirements?

Calr

From: Charles Locke

Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:20 AM

To: Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>; Carl Monroe <cmonroe@spp.org>

Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>; Steve Davis <sdavis@spp.org>

Subject: Draft presentation about load reporting

Paul and Carl,

Attached is a draft presentation for the stakeholder conference call on March 28. This has only the FERC requirements portion of the discussion. We need to add slides addressing the survey results, which Steve can provide.

Please let me know whether this discussion of Tariff and FERC requirements is along the lines of what you had in mind and whether you have any changes or additions to it.

Thanks.

Charles

This email and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential information. If you receive this email in error, please notify the sender, delete the original and all copies of the email and destroy any other hard copies of it.

From: [Steve Davis](#)
To: [Charles Locke](#); [Carl Monroe](#); [Paul Suskie](#)
Cc: [Sam Loudenslager](#); [Tony Alexander](#)
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting
Date: Thursday, March 22, 2018 11:22:56 AM

Agree on the rabbit trails if we go there. I believe it's good discussion, but could quickly derail what we want to accomplish on this call. Maybe we mention it as an "other impact" point, and just bring up if we cover plenty of ground on the BTM and Schedule 11 discussions?

Thanks,
Steve

From: Charles Locke
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 11:15 AM
To: Carl Monroe; Paul Suskie
Cc: Sam Loudenslager; Tony Alexander; Steve Davis
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

We do have some of those GFA issues, which is one reason the Resident Load GFA requirement is stated on slide 7. That addresses the need to include GFAs in Schedule 11 billing.

We also could dive into the GFA issues with respect to Schedule 9. The problem there is that the approach becomes complicated very quickly. Whether or not GFAs should be included in Schedule 9 loads is dependent on how the host TO treats GFAs in its formula rate (for example, whether or not the TO is crediting GFA revenues in the formula rate and whether or not the cost of the associated facilities is included in rate base). There is an outstanding argument between two UMZ parties concerning that.

So the treatment of GFAs in Schedule 9 loads is situational. It also can involve SPP billing for hypothetical NITS under Attachment L. We could add a slide to summarize these points. As always, there is a risk that the discussion will head down some long rabbit trails.

Charles

From: Carl Monroe
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:26 AM
To: Charles Locke <clocke@spp.org>; Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>
Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>; Steve Davis <sdavis@spp.org>
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Looks good... also, a question..

Do we have any issues with GFAs and resident load that we also need to cover thoughts on the requirements?

Calr

From: Charles Locke

Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:20 AM

To: Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>; Carl Monroe <cmonroe@spp.org>

Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>; Steve Davis <sdavis@spp.org>

Subject: Draft presentation about load reporting

Paul and Carl,

Attached is a draft presentation for the stakeholder conference call on March 28. This has only the FERC requirements portion of the discussion. We need to add slides addressing the survey results, which Steve can provide.

Please let me know whether this discussion of Tariff and FERC requirements is along the lines of what you had in mind and whether you have any changes or additions to it.

Thanks.

Charles

This email and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential information. If you receive this email in error, please notify the sender, delete the original and all copies of the email and destroy any other hard copies of it.

From: [Charles Locke](#)
To: [Carl Monroe](#); [Paul Suskie](#)
Cc: [Sam Loudenslager](#); [Tony Alexander](#); [Steve Davis](#)
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

We do have some of those GFA issues, which is one reason the Resident Load GFA requirement is stated on slide 7. That addresses the need to include GFAs in Schedule 11 billing.

We also could dive into the GFA issues with respect to Schedule 9. The problem there is that the approach becomes complicated very quickly. Whether or not GFAs should be included in Schedule 9 loads is dependent on how the host TO treats GFAs in its formula rate (for example, whether or not the TO is crediting GFA revenues in the formula rate and whether or not the cost of the associated facilities is included in rate base). There is an outstanding argument between two UMZ parties concerning that.

So the treatment of GFAs in Schedule 9 loads is situational. It also can involve SPP billing for hypothetical NITS under Attachment L. We could add a slide to summarize these points. As always, there is a risk that the discussion will head down some long rabbit trails.

Charles

From: Carl Monroe
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:26 AM
To: Charles Locke <clocke@spp.org>; Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>
Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>; Steve Davis <sdavis@spp.org>
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting

Looks good... also, a question..

Do we have any issues with GFAs and resident load that we also need to cover thoughts on the requirements?

Calr

From: Charles Locke
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:20 AM
To: Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>; Carl Monroe <cmonroe@spp.org>
Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>; Steve Davis <sdavis@spp.org>
Subject: Draft presentation about load reporting

Paul and Carl,

Attached is a draft presentation for the stakeholder conference call on March 28. This has only the

FERC requirements portion of the discussion. We need to add slides addressing the survey results, which Steve can provide.

Please let me know whether this discussion of Tariff and FERC requirements is along the lines of what you had in mind and whether you have any changes or additions to it.

Thanks.

Charles

This email and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential information. If you receive this email in error, please notify the sender, delete the original and all copies of the email and destroy any other hard copies of it.

From: [Carl Monroe](#)
To: [Charles Locke](#); [Paul Suskie](#)
Cc: [Sam Loudenslager](#); [Tony Alexander](#); [Steve Davis](#)
Subject: RE: Draft presentation about load reporting
Date: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:25:53 AM

Looks good... also, a question..

Do we have any issues with GFAs and resident load that we also need to cover thoughts on the requirements?

Calr

From: Charles Locke
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2018 10:20 AM
To: Paul Suskie <psuskie@spp.org>; Carl Monroe <cmonroe@spp.org>
Cc: Sam Loudenslager <sloudenslager@spp.org>; Tony Alexander <talexander@spp.org>; Steve Davis <sdavis@spp.org>
Subject: Draft presentation about load reporting

Paul and Carl,

Attached is a draft presentation for the stakeholder conference call on March 28. This has only the FERC requirements portion of the discussion. We need to add slides addressing the survey results, which Steve can provide.

Please let me know whether this discussion of Tariff and FERC requirements is along the lines of what you had in mind and whether you have any changes or additions to it.

Thanks.

Charles

This email and any attachments are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential information. If you receive this email in error, please notify the sender, delete the original and all copies of the email and destroy any other hard copies of it.